	Case 5:07-cv-03668-RMW	Document 7	Filed 04/	14/2008	Page 1 of 4					
1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of the State of California									
2	DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General									
3	GERALD A. ENGLER Senior Assistant Attorney General									
4	GREGORY A. OTT Deputy Attorney General									
5	ALLEN R. CRÓWN Deputy Attorney General									
6	State Bar No. 56818 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000									
7	Telephone: (415) 703-5847									
8	Fax: (415) 703-1234 E-mail: Allen.Crown@doj.	ca.gov								
9	Attorneys for Respondent									
10										
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
12	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
13 14	SAN JOSE DIVISION									
15	MICHAEL DAVID GUTII	FRREZ		C 07-36	68 RMW (PR)					
16	MICHAEL DAVID GUII		Petitioner,		ER TO ORDER TO					
17	v.		cutioner,		CAUSE					
18	JAMES A. YATES, Warde	en,								
19	,		spondent.							
20			_							
21	Respondent provides this answer to the Order to Show Cause why the petition for writ of									
22	habeas corpus should not be granted.									
23	I.									
24	CUSTODY									
25	Petitioner is lawfully in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and									
26	Rehabilitation as the result of a judgment of conviction in Santa Clara County in Case No.									
27	CC456850.									
28	On June 16, 2004, the District Attorney filed an information in Santa Clara County									
	Answer To Order To Show Cause - <i>Gutierrez v. Yates</i> , C 07-3668 RMW (PR)									
ļ	I									

26

27

28

Superior Court accusing petitioner, Michael David Gutierrez, as follows: count one, carjacking where the victim is the driver in violation of California Penal Code § 215¹/₂ with enhancements for personal use of a deadly weapon within the meaning of § 12022(b)(1), and personally inflicting great bodily injury within the meaning of §§ 12022.7 and 1203(e)(3); count two, assault with a deadly weapon in violation of § 245(a)(1), with enhancements for personal use of a deadly weapon within the meaning of §§ 667 and 1192.7 and personally inflicting great bodily injury within the meaning of §§ 12022.7(a) and 1203(e)(3). It was further alleged that petitioner had been previously convicted of two felonies for which he had served separate prison terms within the meaning of § 667.5(b), including one of which was a violent or serious felony within the meaning of §§ 667.5(c) and 1192.7(c), and a serious felony within the meaning of §§ 667.5(a) and 1192.7. 1 CT 9-13.

On November 23, 2004, a jury returned verdicts of guilty and found the allegations of weapon use and infliction of great bodily injury to be true. 1 CT 147-51. Both parties waived their rights to a jury trial of the prior-conviction allegations. 1 CT 151.

On December 6, 2004, the District Attorney's motion to dismiss the prior-conviction allegations under § 667.5 was granted, and the court found the remaining prior-conviction allegations to be true. 1 CT 154.

On February 17, 2005, the court sentenced petitioner to state prison for a term of twentysix years, consisting of eighteen years for double the upper term for count one, plus three years for the great-bodily-injury enhancement, plus five years for the prior-conviction enhancement. A sentence of six years for double the midterm for count two was imposed concurrently. 1 CT 233-35.

On November 20, 2006, the California Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, affirmed the judgment. Exh. F.

On February 7, 2007, the California Supreme Court denied petitioner's petition for review. Exh. H.

> On July 17, 2007, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in this Court. On February 12, 2008, this Court issued an order to show cause.

1. Unspecified statutory references are to the California Penal Code.

1

2

VERIFICATION

II.

3

Petitioner signed and verified the petition.

4

III.

5 6

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DENIALS

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Respondent denies that the state court's rulings were based on unreasonable determinations of facts or were contrary to or involved an unreasonable application of clearly established United States Supreme Court law. Respondent specifically denies petitioner's claims as follows: one, petitioner's federal constitutional right to due process was violated when the trial court improperly allowed the testimony that Mr. Lionetti had identified petitioner in person, in a one-person show up at the hospital, which was erroneously admitted over objection in violation of his right to confrontation; two, petitioner's federal constitutional right to due process was violated when the trial court erred in excluding evidence which provided an alternative reason for petitioner to avoid contact with the police on January 7, 2004; and three, the cumulative errors were prejudicial.

IV.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Petitioner exhausted state remedies for his claims that are contained in the petition. Petitioner filed his petition within the one-year statute of limitations period set by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

V.

LODGED DOCUMENTS

Respondent is lodging concurrently with this answer the following exhibits:

EXHIBIT A Clerk's Transcript (2 vols.), *People v. Gutierrez*, Santa Clara County Case No. CC456850.

EXHIBIT B Reporter's Transcript (4 vols.), *People v. Gutierrez*, Santa Clara County Case No. CC456850.

EXHIBIT C Appellant's Opening Brief, People v. Gutierrez, California Court of Appeal Case No. H028515.

Answer To Order To Show Cause - *Gutierrez v. Yates*, C 07-3668 RMW (PR)

	Case 5:07-cv-0360	68-RMW	Document 7	Filed 04/14/2008	Page 4 of 4			
1	EXHIBIT D	KHIBIT D Respondent's Brief, <i>People v. Gutierrez</i> , California Court of Appeal Case No. H028515.						
2	EVIIIDITE	Appellant's Reply Brief, <i>People v. Gutierrez</i> , California Court of Appeal Case No. H028515.						
3	EXHIBIT E							
4	EXHIBIT F	Opinion, People v. Gutierrez, California Court of Appeal Case No. H028515.						
5	EXHIBIT G	Petition For Review, <i>People v. Gutierrez</i> , California Supreme Court Case No. S149143.						
6 7	EXHIBIT H	Denial Of Review, <i>People v. Gutierrez</i> , California Supreme Court Case No. S149143.						
8	VI.							
9	INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE							
10	Respondent hereby incorporates by reference the accompanying memorandum of points							
11	and authorities in support of this answer.							
12	VII.							
13	CONCLUSION							
14	Respondent respectfully requests that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied with							
15	prejudice.							
16	Dated: April 14, 2008							
17			Respectfully sul	bmitted,				
18	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of the State of California							
19	DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General GERALD A. ENGLER Senior Assistant Attorney General GREGORY A. OTT							
20								
21								
22			Deputy Attorne					
23			/s/ Allen R. Cro ALLEN R. CRO	wn DWN				
24			Deputy Attorne	y General				
25			Attorneys for R	espondent				
26								
27								
28								